



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,743	12/21/2001	Seppo Pyhalammi	4208-4023	6150

7590 02/09/2004
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/029,743

Applicant(s)

PYHALAMMI ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/03 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground of rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards et al. US patent 6,591,288 and further in view of McLain US patent 6,493,758 and Reilly et al. US patent 5,740,549.

As per claim 1, Edwards teaches a method for a wireless terminal to browse content, comprising:

monitoring browsing activity of a user and storing browsed content in a personal network cache [fig.3 steps 67, 68, col.5 lines 19-22];

Art Unit: 2153

analyzing said browsed content to determine frequently visited content [col.6 lines 1-11, col.7 lines 24-25];

Edwards does not teach transmitting the frequent visited content to a local cache on the terminal. In a similar field of invention, McLain teaches providing a local cache on a mobile device to enable offline browsing [see abstract, col.3 lines 40-49]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of McLain with Edwards because it would have enable the wireless terminal to have access to frequent visited content while offline and to reduce connection cost.

McLain does not specifically teach periodically transmit the frequent visited content to the terminal cache. In similar field of invention, Reilly teaches providing a user profile specifying the type of content the user interested in and scheduling periodic interval for retrieving content to the user terminal. [see Reilly col.7 lines 44-68, col.8 lines 19-44]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Reilly with Edwards and McLain because it would have enable the system to customized the content and retrieval time that is most convenient or least cost.

As per claim 2, McLain teaches user selected content [col. 3 lines 43-44].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 3, Edwards teaches identify related content [col.5 lines 26-35]. Reilly teaches identify and retrieve related content to the user terminal [col.7 lines 13-30]. It would have been obvious in the system as modified to download related content to the local cache because it would have enabled the user to have quick access to the related content offline.

As per claim 4, Edwards teaches extracting from personal caches of other wireless terminal users [col.6 lines 49-55].

As per claims 5 and 7, Edwards does not teach highlighting frequent visited content and changed portions. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have enabled the user to visually know the status of the contents.

As per claim 6, Reilly teaches user specified update frequency [col.8 lines 19-44].

As per claim 8, Reilly teaches update at a time the network is less utilized [col.8 lines 19-25].

As per claim 9, Edwards teaches deleting content that not qualified as frequently visited [col.7 lines 20-23].

As per claim 10, McLain teaches formatting content for presentation of the wireless terminal [abstract, col.3 lines 55-60]. It is apparent that content which cannot be displayed on the terminal are deleted. It would have been obvious for one of

Art Unit: 2153

ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have freed the cache storage space for other contents.

As per claim 11, Edwards teaches retrieving the latest version of the content from the network [fig.3 step 56, 58, 59].

As per claims 12-13, Reilly teaches class of delivery [news text, image, administrative update, advertisement etc.] Reilly teaches the class of delivery, network capacity, usage, and size of the contents determines when update occurs. (see col. 8 lines 19-68 and col.9 lines 1-10).

As per claim 14, Edwards teaches user profile indicating frequently visited content [col.7 lines 24-26].

As per claim 15, Edwards teaches the frequent contents are web pages [col.5 lines 26-35].

Claims 16-20 and 21-24 are system corresponding to the method of claims 1-15. They are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 1-15 above.

As per claim 25, Edwards teaches a mobile browsing booster system comprising:

a layer 7 switch [fig.2 14, 20] equipped with a web proxy [14] for monitoring data network based browsing activity of a wireless terminal user [see fig.3];

a data base for storing content browsed by the user [fig.2 28];

a browsing agent [26] for analyzing content stored in network cache to determine frequently visited content [fig.4].

Edwards does not teach transmitting the frequent visited content to a local cache on the terminal for browsing without establishing a network connection. In a similar field of invention, McLain teaches providing a local cache on a mobile device to enable offline browsing [see abstract, col.3 lines 40-49]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of McLain with Edwards because it would have enable the wireless terminal to have access to frequent visited content while offline and to reduce connection cost.

McLain does not specifically teach periodically transmit the frequent visited content to the terminal cache. In similar field of invention, Reilly teaches providing a user profile specifying the type of content the user interested in and scheduling periodic interval for retrieving content to the user terminal. [see Reilly col.7 lines 44-68, col.8 lines 19-44]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Reilly with Edwards and McLain because it would have enable the system to customized the content and retrieval time that is most convenient or least cost.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 26, McLain teaches analyzing content according type specified by the user [col. 3 lines 43-44].

As per claim 27, Reilly teaches scheduled delivery [col.8 lines 19-44].

As per claim 28, the reference does not specifically disclose comparing identifier to selectively monitoring a user's browsing session. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to selectively monitor browsing session because it would have improved the privacy of the users of system to enable the user to choose to have his browsing session monitored.

As per claims 29-31, Edwards teaches sending the latest versions of contents from the web proxy [fig.3 56, 54, 52].

As per claims 32-33, Edwards teaches plural of personal network caches [col.7 lines 24-26].

As per claim 34, McLain teaches formatting content for presentation of the wireless terminal [col.3 lines 55-60].

As per claims 35-36, Edwards does not teach highlighting frequent visited content and changed portions. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so because it would have enabled the user to visually know the status of the contents.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 29, Edwards teaches the frequently visited and related contents are stored in the network cache prior to transmission to the terminal [col.6 lines 54-60].

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2153

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
February 6, 2004